

REMARKS

Claim 4 has been objected to due to a wording informality. Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness in view of the cited Mitts reference (US 5,896,373) in view of the cited Guo reference (US 6,389,034). [The Examiner cites 35 U.S.C. §102 (b), but is assumed he meant "103(a)".] Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Mitts in view of the cited Guo reference in view of the cited Stanwood reference. Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Mitts (US 5,896,373) in view of Guo (US 6,389,034) further in view of Mitts (US 5,940,371). The Examiner has objected to claim 6 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but indicated that that claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. Claim 7 is allowed.

Claim 1 has been amended by combining it with claim 6 and claim 6 has been cancelled. Claim 1 as amended thus now appears to be allowable, as indicated by the Examiner.


Claims 2-4 have been amended to depend on the allowed claim 7 so should now also be allowable.

The amendment to the dependency of claim 4 has rendered moot the informality raised against claim 4. Accordingly the objection to wording should fall away.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at **973 386 8252**

Respectfully submitted,

**Urs Peter Bernhard
Stefan Gruhl
Jens Mueckenheim**

By 
**Stephen M. Gurey
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 27336**

Date: January 5, 2006

**Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Room 3J-219
Holmdel, New Jersey 07733-3030**